

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding final Office Action mailed June 1, 2005. Upon entry of this response, claims 1-5 are canceled without prejudice, waiver, or disclaimer and claims 6-20 remain pending in the present application and have not been amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added to the present application.

Response To Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. Section 103

The Office Action indicates that claims 6-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over US publication 2002/0007317 to Callaghan et al in view of Sears, Jr. et al. (US Publication 2002/0133540).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

It is well established at law that, for a proper rejection of a claim under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious based upon a combination of references, the cited combination of references must disclose, teach, or suggest, either implicitly or explicitly, all elements/features/steps of the claim at issue. See, e.g., *In Re Dow Chemical*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1529, 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1988), and *In re Keller*, 208 U.S.P.Q. 871, 881 (C.C.P.A. 1981).

Independent Claim 6 recites:

Claim 6: A computing device, comprising:

means for receiving a first cookie that is valid for a first range of URL's from a first WEB client;

means for receiving a first request for a cookie that is valid for a first URL from a second WEB client; and

means for responding to the first request by transmitting the first cookie to the second WEB client if the first URL is within the first range of URL's.

Appl. No. 09/874,104
Docket no. 10003219-1
Response to Office Action dated 6/1/05

(5)

With regard to claim 6, the Examiner states: “*Sears, Jr. et al. teaches means for receiving a first cookie that is valid for a first range of URL's from a first WEB client; transmitting the first cookie to the second WEB if the first URL is within the first range of URL's...*”

Applicant's respectfully disagree.

Sears, Jr. et al describes a Cookie Server that automatically generates a cookie for a client. There is no indication that Sears' Cookie Server operates to receive a cookie from a Web Client. Moreover, nowhere does Sears describe a computing device that operates to receive a first cookie from a first Web Client and that can transmit this same cookie to a second Web client.

Accordingly, the cited combination of references does not disclose, teach, or suggest (either implicitly or explicitly) all elements of claim 6 and the rejection of claim 6 should be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 7, The Examiner States: “*Callaghan teaches the computing device of claim 6, wherein the first WEB Client and the second Web Client are two different computing devices (fig. 1).*”

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Fig. 1 in Callaghan only shows a single WEB Client. Callaghan, therefore, does not teach or suggest the computing device of claim 6 wherein the first Web client and the second Web Client are two different computing devices.

Accordingly, the cited combination of references does not disclose, teach, or suggest (either implicitly or explicitly) all elements of claim 7 and the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 8, the Examiner States: “*Sears, Jr. et al. teaches wherein the first cookie receiving means is configured to receive the first cookie from the first WEB client over a network (page 2, section 0016).*”

Appl. No. 09/874,104
Docket no. 10003219-1
Response to Office Action dated 6/1/05

(6)

Applicant's respectfully disagree and Applicant's respectfully assert that the Examiner is apparently misinterpreting the Sears description at page 2, section 0016.

Sears states, in section 0016, that "the client need not store the cookie". Nowhere does Sears state, however, that the Cookie Server receives cookies from Web Clients. The Sears Cookie Server operates to generate cookies for Web clients but does not receive cookies from Web Clients.

Accordingly, the cited combination of references does not disclose, teach, or suggest (either implicitly or explicitly) all elements of claim 8 and the rejection of claim 8 should be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 9, the Examiner States: "Sears, Jr. et al. teaches means for receiving a second cookie that is valid for a second range of URL's from the second WEB client; and transmitting the second cookie to the first WEB client if the second URL is within the second range of URL's..."

Applicant's respectfully disagree and Applicant's respectfully assert that the Examiner is apparently misinterpreting the Sears description at page 2, section 0016 and section 0025.

As previously noted, the Sears Cookie Server operates to generate cookies for Web clients but does not receive cookies from Web Clients. Further, nowhere does Sears teach a device that can receive a second cookie from a second Web client and that can transmit this same cookie to first WEB client.

Accordingly, the cited combination of references does not disclose, teach, or suggest (either implicitly or explicitly) all elements of claim 9 and the rejection of claim 9 should be withdrawn.

With regard to dependent claims 10 and 11, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as a matter of law, for at least the reason that these claims contain all the features and limitations of independent claim 6.

With regard to claim 12, the Examiner States: "Sears, Jr. et al. teaches transmitting the first cookie to a remote computer (page 2, second 0016)."

Applicant's respectfully disagree.

Sears does not teach a WEB client that is operable to respond to receiving a first resource and first cookie by transmitting the first cookie to a remote computer. As noted above, the Cookie Server described by Sears operates to generate cookies for Web clients but does not receive cookies from Web Clients and WEB clients do not transmit cookies to the Sears Cookie Server.

Accordingly, the cited combination of references does not disclose, teach, or suggest (either implicitly or explicitly) all elements of claim 12 and the rejection of claim 12 should be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 13, the Examiner States: "Sears, Jr. et al. teaches transmitting the second cookie to a remote computer (page 2, second 0016)."

Applicant's respectfully disagree.

Sears does not teach a WEB client that is operable to respond to receiving a second resource and second cookie by transmitting the second cookie to a remote computer. As noted above, the Cookie Server described by Sears operates to generate cookies for Web clients but does not receive cookies from Web Clients and WEB clients do not transmit cookies to the Sears Cookie Server.

Accordingly, the cited combination of references does not disclose, teach, or suggest (either implicitly or explicitly) all elements of claim 13 and the rejection of claim 13 should be withdrawn.

With regard to dependent claim 14, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as a matter of law, for at least the reason that these claims contain all the features and limitations of independent claim 12.

With regard to claim 15, it is respectfully submitted that contrary to the Examiners' assertions, the Callaghan reference does not teach element (a) or element (b) of claim 15.

The Intermediary Application 110 described by Callaghan for example, operates to intercept requests from a Web Client to a Server, can add state information to the intercepted request and can then forward the intercepted request (including the state information) to the server. In contrast, the remote computer of claim 15, operates to transmit a first or a second cookie to the WEB Client.

It also respectfully submitted, that contrary to the Examiners assertions, the Sears reference does not teach a remote computer that is operable to receive a first cookie from a first Web Client and a second cookie from a second Web Client. As noted above, the Cookie Server described by Sears operates to generate cookies for Web clients but does not receive cookies from Web Clients.

Accordingly, the cited combination of references does not disclose, teach, or suggest (either implicitly or explicitly) all elements of claim 15 and the rejection of claim 15 should be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 16, Examiner states: "*Callaghan et al. teaches the system of claim 14, further comprising: the remote computer, and further configured to automatically respond to the request by transmitting the cookie to the first WEB client.*"

Applicants respectfully disagree.

As previously noted, the Intermediary Application 110 described by Callaghan for example, operates to intercept requests from a Web Client to a Server, can add state information to the intercepted request and can then forward the intercepted request (including the state information) to the server. The Intermediary Application 110 does not respond to requests (from a Web Client) for a cookie by transmitting the cookie to the WEB Client.

Also with regard to claim 16, the Examiner states: "*Sears et al. teaches the remote computer operable to receive a cookie that is valid for the URL from the second WEB client and to respond thereto by storing the cookie in a memory...*".

Applicants respectfully disagree.

As noted above, the Cookie Server described by Sears operates to generate cookies for Web clients but does not receive cookies from Web Clients.

Accordingly, the cited combination of references does not disclose, teach, or suggest (either implicitly or explicitly) all elements of claim 16 and the rejection of claim 16 should be withdrawn.

With regard to dependent claim 17, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as a matter of law, for at least the reason that these claims contain all the features and limitations of independent claim 12.

With regard to claim 18, the Examiner States: "*Sears et. al teaches wherein the first device is a printer.*"

Applicants respectfully disagree. Nowhere does Sears describe a printer.

Accordingly, the cited combination of references does not disclose, teach, or suggest (either implicitly or explicitly) all elements of claim 18 and the rejection of claim 18 should be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 19, the Examiner states: "*Sears et. al teaches further comprising the printer; and wherein the printer includes a replaceable consumable cartridge...*"

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Nowhere does Sears describe a printer. Further, Sears does not teach a printer that includes a replaceable consumable cartridge.

Appl. No. 09/874,104 (10)
Docket no. 10003219-1
Response to Office Action dated 6/1/05

Accordingly, the cited combination of references does not disclose, teach, or suggest (either implicitly or explicitly) all elements of claim 19 and the rejection of claim 19 should be withdrawn.

With regard to claim 20, the Examiner states: "Sears, Jr. et al. teaches wherein the printer is a laser printer..."

Applicants respectfully disagree. Nowhere does Sears describe a printer.

Accordingly, the cited combination of references does not disclose, teach, or suggest (either implicitly or explicitly) all elements of claim 20 and the rejection of claim 20 should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submits that all rejections have been traversed and that the now pending claims 6-20 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (208) 396-5263.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert E. Haines

By: 
Matthew L. Wade
Reg. No. 42,206

Date: 8/1/05

Appl. No. 09/874,104
Docket no. 10003219-1
Response to Office Action dated 6/1/05

(11)